

Application No. 10/661,717  
Response to OA of 11/25/05

### Remarks

In the present response, six claims (1, 8, 13, 18, 22, and 27) are amended; and three claims (5, 9, and 21) are canceled. Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-20, and 22-27 are presented for examination.

#### I. Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 102

Claims 1 and 4-7 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2003/0021083 (Landry). This rejection is traversed.

A proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that a single prior art reference disclose each element of the claim. See MPEP § 2131, also, *W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 U.S.P.Q. 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Since Landry neither teaches nor suggests each element in claims 1 and 4-7, these claims are allowable over Landry.

#### Claim 1

Independent claim 1 recites numerous limitations that are not taught or suggested in Landry. For example, claim 1 recites a mounting arm that "has a curved portion that abuts and supports the display in a horizontal position and a straight portion that abuts and supports the display in a vertical position." Nowhere does Landry teach or suggest these recitations.

First, FIGS. 6-8 in Landry show a mounting arm 204 that couples a base 194 to a display 88. This mounting arm, however, does not have a curved portion that abuts and supports the display in the horizontal position. Landry never shows the display in the horizontal position. Even if Landry's display were rotated to a horizontal position, the curved portion of the mounting arm 204 would not both abut and support the display in the horizontal position.

Second, FIG. 6 in Landry shows the display 88 in a vertical position while being connected to the mounting arm 204. As shown in FIG. 6, the mounting arm 204 does not have a straight portion that both abuts and supports the display 88 in the vertical position.

Application No. 10/661,717  
Response to OA of 11/25/05

For at least these reasons, claim 1 is allowable over Landry. A dependent claim inherits the recitations of a base claim. Thus, for at least the reasons given in connection with independent claim 1, its dependent claims are also allowable over Landry.

## II. Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 102

Claims 8-11 and 13-25 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Landry or under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over Landry. These rejections are traversed.

### Claim 8

Independent claim 8 recites numerous limitations that are not taught or suggested in Landry. For example, claim 8 recites a mounting arm that "has a curved portion that abuts the display to horizontally support the display and a straight portion that abuts the display to vertically support the display above a support surface." Nowhere does Landry teach or suggest these recitations.

First, FIGS. 6-8 in Landry show a mounting arm 204 that couples a base 194 to a display 88. This mounting arm, however, does not have a curved portion that abuts the display to horizontally support the display. In Landry, the curved portion of the mounting arm 204 is not capable of abutting the display to horizontally support the display. Second, in Landry, the mounting arm 204 does have a straight portion. This straight portion, however, is not capable of abutting the display to vertically support the display above the a support surface.

For at least these reasons, claim 8 is allowable over Landry. A dependent claim inherits the recitations of a base claim. Thus, for at least the reasons given in connection with independent claim 8, its dependent claims are also allowable over Landry.

### Claim 13

Independent claim 13 recites numerous limitations that are not taught or suggested in Landry. For example, claim 13 recites adjusting the display to a vertical position "such that the display abuts a straight portion of the curved mounting arm." Nowhere does Landry teach or suggest these recitations.

Application No. 10/661,717  
Response to OA of 11/25/05

FIG. 6 in Landry shows the display 88 in a vertical position. Notice that the display 88 does not abut the straight section of the curved mounting arm 204. As shown in Landry, the straight section of the curved mounting arm is removed or away from the display. Thus, Landry does not teach or suggest adjusting the display to a vertical position "such that the display abuts a straight portion of the curved mounting arm."

For at least these reasons, claim 13 is allowable over Landry. A dependent claim inherits the recitations of a base claim. Thus, for at least the reasons given in connection with independent claim 13, its dependent claims are also allowable over Landry.

#### Claim 18

Independent claim 18 recites numerous limitations that are not taught or suggested in Landry. For example, claim 18 recites that when the display is supported off the support surface and above the base, then the display "abuts against a straight portion of the means for connecting." Nowhere does Landry teach or suggest these recitations.

FIG. 6 in Landry shows the display 88 supported off the support surface and above the base. Notice that the display 88 does not abut the straight section of the mounting arm 204. As shown in Landry, the straight section of the mounting arm is removed or away from the display. Thus, Landry does not teach or suggest when the display is supported off the support surface and above the base, then the display "abuts against a straight portion of the means for connecting."

For at least these reasons, claim 18 is allowable over Landry. A dependent claim inherits the recitations of a base claim. Thus, for at least the reasons given in connection with independent claim 18, its dependent claims are also allowable over Landry.

#### **III. Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103**

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Landry. For at least the reasons given above in connection with independent claim 1, dependent claims 2 and 3 are allowable over Landry.

Application No. 10/661,717  
Response to OA of 11/25/05

#### IV. Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Landry in view of USPN 6,219,681 (Hawkins). Hawkins fails to cure the deficiencies of Landry. Thus, for at least the reasons given above in connection with independent claim 8, dependent claim 12 is allowable over Landry in view of Hawkins.


#### CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicants believe all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Philip S. Lyren at Telephone No. (281) 514-8236, Facsimile No. (281) 514-8332. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Hewlett-Packard Company  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

  
Philip S. Lyren

Reg. No. 40,709  
Ph: 281-514-8236

**CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8**  
The undersigned hereby certifies that this paper or papers, as described herein, is being transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office facsimile number 571-273-8300 on this 06 day of January, 2006.

By   
Name: Carrie McKerley